

Post-Implementation Report

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Project Name: Healthy Steps (SCHIP)

Date: 3/13/2006

Project Sponsor: Department of Human Services

Project Manager: Terry Focke

Report Prepared By: Terry Focke

CATEGORIES: Categories of the report correspond to the categories in the Post-Project Survey.

For each category, the Overall Rating is the average of the ratings provided on completed survey forms for that category (1=Not at All, or Poor, 2=Adequately, or Satisfactory, 3=To a great extent, or Excellent)

A. PRODUCT EFFECTIVENESS

This project was designed to take a stand-alone Healthy Steps program and integrate it into the Vision Computer system. By doing this, it allows cases to be worked by multiple entities. The case can be worked by a State worker or a County Eligibility worker. This allows the case to be worked more efficiently and quickly. This was done with the help of The Information Technology Services Department, The Department of Human Services Personnel, County Staff and staff from the Dakota Medical Foundation. The new process has been very successful in all aspects. The process is easier and has allowed more Children than ever before access to health care. Prior to this system, there were approximately 2412 children enrolled in this program and as of today, there are approximately 3482 children enrolled and that number continues to rise monthly.

Overall Survey Rating: 3

B. CSSQ MANAGEMENT

The management of the project was very effective. All changes were approved by the project team before being included in the project. There were weekly management meetings and also weekly team meetings to discuss any problems and scheduling issues. These meetings were very well attended by all project staff and all aspects of the project were discussed. This project went very smoothly and all issues were resolved in a timely manner. The issues that came up were not usually in the scope change area but more in the how to accomplish a certain issue that we already knew about.

Overall Survey Rating: 3

C. RISK MANAGEMENT

The biggest risk we had in this project was the possibility of losing knowledgeable staff during the project. This would have given us the risk of not completing the project on time. This risk never happened and we had very professional staff that knew what their job was and completed it to the best of their ability.

Overall Survey Rating: 3

Post-Implementation Report

D. COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT

The communications of this project went well for the most part. We used lotus notes and the Work Management (WMS) computer application to record all minutes of meetings, issues, problems, status reports and all aspects of the project. We also used email as a primary source of communications between staff. You can always do better on communications but we believe that the communications on this project was very good. We had staff from all across the state to communicate with and these types of communications worked well.

Overall Survey Rating: 2

E. ACCEPTANCE MANAGEMENT

We used lotus notes and the Work Management system application for all acceptance documentation. We had an acceptance signoff for the project plan signoff, the analysis plan signoff, the development signoff, and the implementation signoff. All the signoffs were approved by the project team without any incident.

Overall Survey Rating: 3

F. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT

There were no issues with change management. All changes to the project were documented and approved by all the project team and signed off by the project manager in the Work Management System.

Overall Survey Rating: 3

G. ISSUES MANAGEMENT

All issues were documented in meeting minutes and by the use of issues or problems within the Work Management System and with the use of a lotus notes application. All issues were discussed completely and the solutions agreed upon by all before proceeding with the project.

Overall Survey Rating: 3

H. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND TRANSITION

The project was put into production with no major issues outstanding. Once in production, there were few if any problems with the design of the system. As items are identified to improve the processing and efficiency, enhancements are made to the system.

Overall Survey Rating: 3

I. PERFORMANCE OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION

The entities involved in this project were: Information Technology Services Department, Department of Human Services Information Services staff, Department of Human Services Medical Services Staff, Department of Human Services Economic Assistance staff, County Staff, and Staff

Post-Implementation Report

from Dakota Medical Foundation. These staff all worked very well together to accomplish this project within budget and within the time frame.

Overall Survey Rating: 3

J. PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT TEAM

The project was broken down into: Vision Help Desk project team, ITD Programmers project team, ITD Project Manager, DHS Project Manager, County Staff, and an Executive Committee. Within this we had skilled team members and project leaders. This scheme of staff worked very effectively and smoothly during the project. ITD's understanding of DHS business needs made this project easier to accomplish successfully. This understanding has come about through years of staff building trust in each other because of past working experiences. This trust in each other's judgment makes for a great working relationship and improves the chances of success on projects such as this.

Overall Survey Rating: 3

K. KEY PROJECT METRICS

COST

Final Cost	Final Approved Baseline Cost Estimate	Difference from Final Cost	Original Cost Estimate	Difference from Final Cost
\$ 485,535.20	\$ 487,468.75	\$ -1933.55	\$ 424,514.00	\$ +61,021.20
		.3%		14.8%
Number of approved changes made to the original budget.				4
Number of "re-baselined" budget estimates performed.				4

The budget for this project was \$519,741 so we ended up \$34,205.80 under the funded amount for the project.

SCHEDULE

Number of milestones in baseline schedule.	7
Number of baseline milestones delivered on time (according to last baselined schedule).	7
Difference in elapsed time of original schedule and final actual schedule.	1 month
Difference in elapsed time of final baseline and final actual schedule.	0

We planned on putting this project in production by July 1, 2005 originally. The estimate was to put it into production in May of 2005 but because of approved changes it was put into production in June.

SCOPE

Number of baseline deliverables.	4
Number of deliverables delivered at project completion.	4
Number of scope changes in the post-planning phases.	3

Post-Implementation Report

QUALITY

Number of defects/quality issues identified after delivery.	0
Number of success measures identified in the Business Case that were satisfied or achieved at project completion.	3